

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 and 18-20 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1, 5, 7, 11, 13, 15 and 18 have been amended. Claims 19 and 20 are new. Basis for the amendments and new claims can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings originally filed.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 9 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over De Molina ('239) in view of Wilkins, et al. ('871) and Buma, et al. ('554). Claims 1 and 18 have been amended to define the shock absorber as having a tube. The valve assembly defined as being attached directly to the tube of the shock absorber.

The valve 48 illustrated in De Molina is not attached directly to the tube of the shock absorber. As illustrated in De Molina, valve 48 is disposed between the pair of springs 20 and a pair of valves 110. Each of the valves 110 is attached directly to the shock absorber but valve 48 is not. Wilkins, et al. does not disclose an air spring separate from the shock absorber or a valve assembly attached directly to the tube of the shock absorber. Buma, et al. discloses a vehicle attitude control system but the vehicle attitude control system is not connected to the shock absorbers to control the damping of the shock absorbers as is defined in amended Claims 1 and 18.

Thus, Applicant believes Claims 1 and 18, as amended, patentably distinguish over the art of record. Likewise, Claims 2, 3 and 9, which ultimately depend from Claim

1, are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 4-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over De Molina in view of Wilkins, et al. and Buma as applied to Claim 3 above, and further in view of either Heinz, et al. or Patzenhauer, et al. '885. Claims 4-16 ultimately depend from Claim 1. As stated above, Claim 1 has been amended and is now believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Thus, Claims 4-16 are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIMS

New Claims 19 and 20 are dependent claims which Applicant believed properly further limit their respective base claim.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 9, 2007

By: 

Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MJS/pmg